

# THE DAUGAVET PROPERTY FOR SPACES OF LIPSCHITZ FUNCTIONS

YEVGEN IVAKHNO, VLADIMIR KADETS AND DIRK WERNER

**ABSTRACT.** For a compact metric space  $K$  the space  $\text{Lip}(K)$  has the Daugavet property if and only if the norm of every  $f \in \text{Lip}(K)$  is attained locally. If  $K$  is a subset of an  $L_p$ -space,  $1 < p < \infty$ , this is equivalent to the convexity of  $K$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A Banach space  $X$  is said to have the *Daugavet property* if

$$\|\text{Id} + T\| = 1 + \|T\| \quad (1.1)$$

for every rank-1 operator  $T: X \rightarrow X$ ; then (1.1) also holds for all weakly compact operators on  $X$  and even all operators that do not fix copies of  $\ell_1$ . The Daugavet property was introduced in [5] and further studied in [10] and [6], but examples of spaces having the Daugavet property have long been known; e.g.,  $C[0, 1]$ ,  $L_1[0, 1]$ ,  $L_\infty[0, 1]$ , the disk algebra,  $H^\infty$ , etc.

In this paper we shall investigate the Daugavet property for spaces of Lipschitz functions. Throughout,  $(K, \rho)$  stands for a complete metric space that is not reduced to a singleton. The space of all Lipschitz functions on  $K$  will be equipped with the seminorm

$$\|f\| = \sup \left\{ \frac{|f(t_1) - f(t_2)|}{\rho(t_1, t_2)} : t_1 \neq t_2 \in K \right\}.$$

If one quotients out the kernel of this seminorm, i.e., the constant functions, one obtains the Banach space  $\text{Lip}(K)$ , whose norm will also be denoted by  $\|\cdot\|$ . Equivalently, one can fix a point  $t_0 \in K$  and consider the Banach space  $\text{Lip}_0(K)$  consisting of all Lipschitz functions on  $K$  that vanish at  $t_0$ , with the Lipschitz constant as an actual norm. It is easily seen that  $\text{Lip}(K)$  and  $\text{Lip}_0(K)$  are isometrically isomorphic. In this paper we prefer the first point of view, but will refer to the elements of  $\text{Lip}(K)$  as functions rather than equivalence classes, as is familiar with  $L_p$ -spaces.

Since  $\text{Lip}[0, 1]$  is isometric to  $L_\infty[0, 1]$  via differentiation almost everywhere, it is clear that  $\text{Lip}[0, 1]$  has the Daugavet property. On the other hand the Hölder space  $H^\alpha[0, 1]$ , being the dual of a space with the RNP [13,

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46B04; secondary 46B25, 54E45.

*Key words and phrases.* Lipschitz spaces, Daugavet property, metric convexity.

The work of the second-named author was supported by a fellowship from the *Alexander-von-Humboldt Stiftung*.

p. 83], fails the Daugavet property by the results of [16];  $H^\alpha[0, 1]$  is just the Lipschitz space for  $K = [0, 1]$  with the metric  $\rho_\alpha(s, t) = |s - t|^\alpha$ . But for the unit square  $Q = [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$  with the Euclidean metric it is far from obvious whether the Daugavet property holds for  $\text{Lip}(Q)$ ; in fact, this will turn out to be true as a special case of Theorem 3.1 below. The validity of the Daugavet property of  $\text{Lip}(Q)$  was asked in [15].

Whereas for the “classical” function spaces the validity of the Daugavet property is equivalent to a nonatomicity condition ([3] for  $C(K)$  and  $L_1(\mu)$ , [16] for function algebras, [14] for  $L_1$ -preduals and [8] for the noncommutative case), in the setting of Lipschitz spaces it is a locality condition that plays a similar role, for in Theorem 3.3 we will show for a compact metric space  $K$  that the Daugavet property of  $\text{Lip}(K)$  is equivalent to the fact that every Lipschitz function on  $K$  almost attains its norm at close-by points; see Definition 2.2(a) for precision. We also characterise compact “local” metric spaces by a condition that is reminiscent of metric convexity (Proposition 2.8) and is sometimes even equivalent to it, e.g., for compact subsets of  $L_p$ ,  $1 < p < \infty$  (Proposition 2.9). As a result, for a compact subset of  $L_p$ ,  $1 < p < \infty$ , the Daugavet property of  $\text{Lip}(K)$  is equivalent to the convexity of  $K$ .

An important tool to construct Lipschitz functions is McShane’s extension theorem saying that if  $M \subset K$  and  $f: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a Lipschitz function, then there is an extension to a Lipschitz function  $F: K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with the same Lipschitz constant; see [1, p. 12/13]. This will be used several times.

We will also make use of the following geometric characterisations of the Daugavet property from [5] and [2]. Part (iii) is particularly useful when one doesn’t have full access to the dual space. As for notation, we denote the closed unit ball (resp. sphere) of a Banach space  $X$  by  $B_X$  (resp.  $S_X$ ) and the closed ball with centre  $t$  and radius  $r$  in a metric space  $K$  by  $B_K(t, r)$ .

**Lemma 1.1.** *The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i)  *$X$  has the Daugavet property.*
- (ii) *For every  $y \in S_X$ ,  $x^* \in S_{X^*}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists some  $x \in S_X$  such that  $x^*(x) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$  and  $\|x + y\| \geq 2 - \varepsilon$ .*
- (iii) *For every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and for every  $y \in S_X$  the closed convex hull of the set  $\{u \in (1 + \varepsilon)B_X: \|y + u\| \geq 2 - \varepsilon\}$  contains  $S_X$ .*

## 2. LOCAL METRIC SPACES

Let us recall that a metric space  $K$  is called *metrically convex* if for any two points  $t_1, t_2 \in K$  two closed balls  $B_K(t_1, r_1)$  and  $B_K(t_2, r_2)$  intersect if and only if  $\rho(t_1, t_2) \leq r_1 + r_2$ .

Clearly, convex subsets of normed spaces are metrically convex, and  $S^1 = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2: x^2 + y^2 = 1\}$  is metrically convex for the geodesic metric, but not for the Euclidean metric.

We shall need the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.1.** *A complete metric space  $K$  is metrically convex if and only if for every two distinct points  $t, \tau \in K$  there is an isometric embedding  $\phi: [0, a] \rightarrow K$  (where  $a = \rho(t, \tau)$ ) such that  $\phi(0) = t$ ,  $\phi(a) = \tau$ . In other words,  $K$  is metrically convex if and only if every two points of  $K$  can be connected by an isometric copy of a linear segment.*

*Proof.* The property displayed in the lemma clearly implies the metric convexity of  $K$ . To prove the converse, let  $K$  be metrically convex and let  $t$  and  $\tau$  be two points at a distance  $a$ ; we shall label them  $t_0$  and  $t_a$ . Then there is a point  $t_{a/2} \in B_K(t_0, a/2) \cap B_K(t_a, a/2)$ . It follows that  $\rho(t_0, t_{a/2}) = \rho(t_{a/2}, t_a) = a/2$ . Likewise, pick points  $t_{a/4} \in B_K(t_0, a/4) \cap B_K(t_{a/2}, a/4)$  and  $t_{3/4 a} \in B_K(t_{a/2}, a/4) \cap B_K(t_a, a/4)$ . Continuing in this manner, one obtains for each dyadic rational  $d \in [0, 1]$  a point  $t_{da} \in K$  such that  $\rho(t_{da}, t_{d'a}) = |d - d'|a$ . The mapping  $da \mapsto t_{da}$  can now be extended to an isometric mapping  $\phi: [0, a] \rightarrow K$ , as requested.  $\square$

The following definition is crucial for this paper.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $K$  be a metric space.

- (a) The space  $K$  is called *local* if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and for every function  $f \in \text{Lip}(K)$  there are two distinct points  $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in K$  such that  $\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2) < \varepsilon$  and

$$\frac{f(\tau_2) - f(\tau_1)}{\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2)} > \|f\| - \varepsilon. \quad (2.1)$$

- (b) Let  $f \in \text{Lip}(K)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . A point  $t \in K$  is said to be an  $\varepsilon$ -point of  $f$  if in every neighbourhood  $U \subset K$  of  $t$  there are two points  $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in U$  for which (2.1) holds true.
- (c) The space  $K$  is called *spreadingly local* if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and for every function  $f \in \text{Lip}(K)$  there are infinitely many  $\varepsilon$ -points of  $f$ .

The next proposition provides a large class of examples.

**Proposition 2.3.** *A metrically convex complete metric space  $K$  is spreadingly local.*

*Proof.* Fix an  $\varepsilon > 0$  and a function  $f \in \text{Lip}(K)$  with  $\|f\| = 1$ . Select  $t, \tau \in K$  with  $\rho(t, \tau) > 0$  such that

$$f(\tau) - f(t) > (1 - \varepsilon)\rho(t, \tau).$$

Denote  $a = \rho(t, \tau)$  and apply Lemma 2.1 to this pair of points. The function  $F = f \circ \phi: [0, a] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\phi$  is from Lemma 2.1, is 1-Lipschitz. Hence  $|F'| \leq 1$  a.e. on  $[0, a]$  and

$$\int_0^a F'(r) dr = f(\tau) - f(t) > (1 - \varepsilon)a.$$

Therefore there are infinitely many points  $r_i \in [0, a]$  with  $F'(r_i) > 1 - \varepsilon$ . Let us show that every point of the form  $t_i = \phi(r_i)$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -point of  $f$ . By

the definition of the derivative we have

$$\frac{F(r_i + \delta_i) - F(r_i)}{\delta_i} > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

for sufficiently small  $\delta_i \in (0, \varepsilon)$ . Denote  $\tau_i = \phi(r_i + \delta_i)$ . Then  $\rho(t_i, \tau_i) = \delta_i$  and  $f(\tau_i) - f(t_i) > (1 - \varepsilon)\delta_i$ .  $\square$

Actually this proposition applies to a slightly more general class of spaces  $K$ , defined by the requirement that for each pair of points  $t, \tau \in K$  and each  $\eta > 0$  there exists a curve of length  $\leq \rho(t, \tau) + \eta =: a_\eta$  joining  $t$  and  $\tau$ . In other words, there exists a 1-Lipschitz mapping (having arclength as parameter)  $\phi: [0, a_\eta] \rightarrow K$  with  $\phi(0) = t$ ,  $\phi(a_\eta) = \tau$ . Such spaces could be termed *almost metrically convex*. A variant of the above proof then shows that almost metrically convex spaces are spreadingly local.

*Example 2.4.* There is a (noncompact) almost metrically convex space that is not metrically convex. Indeed, let

$$M = \{f \in L_1[0, 1]: |f| = 1 \text{ a.e.}\};$$

this is a closed subset of  $L_1$ . Instead of the  $L_1$ -norm we shall use the following equivalent norm on  $L_1$ . Pick a total sequence of functionals  $x_n^* \in S_{L_\infty}$  and put, for  $f \in L_1$ ,

$$\|f\| = \|f\|_{L_1} + \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} |x_n^*(f)|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

This norm is strictly convex. It follows that  $M$ , equipped with the metric  $\rho(f, g) = \|f - g\|$ , is not metrically convex since it is not convex; indeed, if  $f, g \in M$ , then *no* nontrivial convex combination belongs to  $M$  (unless  $f = g$ ).

On the other hand,  $(M, \rho)$  is almost metrically convex. To see this let  $f \neq g$  be two functions in  $M$ . For a Borel set  $A \subset [0, 1]$  define  $h_A \in M$  by

$$h_A = f\chi_A + g\chi_{[0, 1] \setminus A}.$$

Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , pick  $\varepsilon' \leq \varepsilon \|f - g\|$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $2(\sum_{n>N} 2^{-n})^{1/2} \leq \varepsilon'$ . Define a nonatomic vector measure taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$  by

$$\mu(A) = (\int_A |f - g|, x_1^*((f - g)\chi_A), \dots, x_N^*((f - g)\chi_A)).$$

By the Lyapunov convexity theorem [9, Th. 5.5] there exists a Borel set  $\Delta$  such that  $\mu(\Delta) = \frac{1}{2}\mu([0, 1])$ . We then have, since  $g - h_\Delta = (g - f)\chi_\Delta$

$$\begin{aligned} \|g - h_\Delta\| &= \|g - h_\Delta\|_{L_1} + \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} |x_n^*(g - h_\Delta)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \int_\Delta |f - g| + \left( \sum_{n=1}^N 2^{-n} |x_n^*((f - g)\chi_\Delta)|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \varepsilon' \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |f - g| + \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{n=1}^N 2^{-n} |x_n^*(f - g)|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \varepsilon' \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \|f - g\| + \varepsilon' \leq \left( \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon \right) \|f - g\|
\end{aligned}$$

and likewise

$$\|f - h_\Delta\| \leq \left( \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon \right) \|f - g\|.$$

Let  $F_0 = f$ ,  $F_1 = g$ ,  $F_{1/2} = h_\Delta$ . Now we reiterate the above construction, first applying it to  $F_0$ ,  $F_{1/2}$  and  $\varepsilon/2$  and then to  $F_{1/2}$ ,  $F_1$  and  $\varepsilon/2$  to obtain functions  $F_{1/4}, F_{3/4} \in M$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\max\{\|F_0 - F_{1/4}\|, \|F_{1/2} - F_{1/4}\|\} &\leq \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \|F_0 - F_{1/2}\|, \\
\max\{\|F_{1/2} - F_{3/4}\|, \|F_1 - F_{1/4}\|\} &\leq \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \|F_1 - F_{1/2}\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Continuing in this manner, we can assign to each dyadic rational  $d \in [0, 1]$  a function  $F_d \in M$  such that the curve  $[0, 1] \rightarrow M$ ,  $t \mapsto F_t$ , obtained from this by continuous extension, has a length that can be estimated from above by

$$\sup_n \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{n-1}} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{n-2}} \right) \cdots \left( \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon \right) 2^n \leq \exp(2^{2-n}\varepsilon + \cdots + 2\varepsilon) \leq e^{4\varepsilon}.$$

Therefore  $M$  is almost metrically convex.

We will need a lemma in order to control the Lipschitz constant of a function by the Lipschitz constant of some restriction under highly technical assumptions that we shall meet later. In the following,  $\sqcup$  is used to indicate a disjoint union.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $A = B \sqcup C$  be a metric space,  $r \in (0, 1/4]$ ,  $\delta < r^2/16$ ,  $\rho(B, C) > r$ . Suppose  $\tilde{C} \subset C$  is a  $\delta$ -net of  $C$  such that every two points of  $\tilde{C}$  are at least  $r$ -distant, and let  $f: A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function that is 1-Lipschitz on  $B \sqcup \tilde{C}$  and also 1-Lipschitz on every ball  $B_A(t, \delta)$  for  $t \in \tilde{C}$ . Then  $f$  is  $(1 + r/2)$ -Lipschitz on the whole space  $A$ .*

*Proof.* Consider arbitrary points  $s_1 \neq s_2 \in A$ . We have to prove that

$$\left| \frac{f(s_2) - f(s_1)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} \right| \leq 1 + r/2. \quad (2.2)$$

We have to distinguish three cases: firstly, when  $s_1, s_2 \in B$ ; secondly, when  $s_1, s_2 \in C$ ; and thirdly, when one of the points (say,  $s_1$ ) belongs to  $B$  and the other belongs to  $C$ .

In the first case (2.2) holds true even with 1 on the right hand side by assumption on  $f$ . Consider the second case. If  $s_1, s_2$  belong to the same ball of the form  $B_A(t, \delta)$  for  $t \in \tilde{C}$ , then the job is likewise done. If not, let  $t_1 \neq t_2 \in \tilde{C}$  be points such that  $\rho(t_1, s_1) \leq \delta$  and  $\rho(t_2, s_2) \leq \delta$ . Then

$$\left| \frac{f(s_2) - f(s_1)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} \right| \leq \left| \frac{f(s_2) - f(t_2)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} \right| + \left| \frac{f(t_2) - f(t_1)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} \right| + \left| \frac{f(t_1) - f(s_1)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{\delta}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} + \frac{\rho(t_2, t_1)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} + \frac{\delta}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} \\
&\leq \frac{2\delta}{r-2\delta} + \frac{\rho(t_2, t_1)}{\rho(t_2, t_1) - 2\delta} \\
&\leq \frac{2\delta}{r-2\delta} + 1 + \frac{2\delta}{\rho(t_2, t_1) - 2\delta} \\
&\leq 1 + \frac{4\delta}{r-2\delta} \leq 1 + r/2.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last case find  $t_2 \in \tilde{C}$  such that  $\rho(t_2, s_2) \leq \delta$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{f(s_2) - f(s_1)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} \right| &\leq \left| \frac{f(s_2) - f(t_2)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} \right| + \left| \frac{f(t_2) - f(s_1)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} \right| \\
&\leq \frac{\delta}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} + \frac{\rho(t_2, s_1)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} \\
&\leq \frac{\delta}{r} + \frac{\rho(t_2, s_1)}{\rho(t_2, s_1) - \delta} \\
&\leq \frac{\delta}{r} + \frac{r}{r-\delta} = 1 + \frac{\delta}{r} + \frac{\delta}{r-\delta} \leq 1 + r/2.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Obviously, a spreadingly local space is local. In the compact case the converse is valid, too, as will be pointed out now.

**Lemma 2.6.** *If  $K$  is compact and local, then it is spreadingly local.*

*Proof.* We will prove by induction on  $n$  that for every  $f \in \text{Lip}(K)$  and for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there are  $n$   $\varepsilon$ -points of  $f$ .

Thanks to the compactness of  $K$  every function  $f \in \text{Lip}(K)$  has a “0-point”, i.e., a point that is an  $\varepsilon$ -point for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Indeed, take a sequence of pairs  $t_n, \tau_n \in K$  satisfying Definition 2.2 with  $\varepsilon = 1/n$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , and take an arbitrary limit point of  $(t_n)$ . So the start of the induction holds true. Now assume the statement for a fixed  $n$  and let us prove it for  $n+1$ .

Take an  $f \in \text{Lip}(K)$  with  $\|f\| = 1$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4]$ . Due to our hypothesis there are  $\varepsilon$ -points  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  of  $f$ . Also, select two points  $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in K$  distinct from all the  $t_i$  and such that

$$\frac{f(\tau_2) - f(\tau_1)}{\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2)} > 1 - \varepsilon/4.$$

Let  $r \in (0, \varepsilon/4]$  be a number so small that the balls  $U_i = B_K(t_i, r)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , are disjoint and contain neither  $\tau_1$  nor  $\tau_2$ . Fix a  $\delta < r^2/16$ , denote the interior of  $B_K(t_i, \delta)$  by  $V_i$  and consider  $\tilde{K} = (K \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i) \sqcup \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_i$  as a subspace of the metric space  $K$ . Define  $\tilde{f}: \tilde{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:  $\tilde{f}(t) = f(t)$  for  $t \in K \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i$  and  $\tilde{f}(t) = f(t_i)$  on the corresponding  $V_i$ . Lemma 2.5 implies that  $\tilde{f}$  satisfies a Lipschitz condition on  $\tilde{K}$  with the constant  $1 + \varepsilon/2$ .

Extend  $\tilde{f}$  to a function on  $K$  preserving the Lipschitz constant, still denoted by  $\tilde{f}$ .

Take as  $t_{n+1}$  an arbitrary 0-point of the function  $g = f + \tilde{f}$ . Since

$$\|g\| \geq \frac{g(\tau_2) - g(\tau_1)}{\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2)} = 2 \frac{f(\tau_2) - f(\tau_1)}{\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2)} > 2 - \varepsilon/2,$$

in every neighbourhood of  $t_{n+1}$  there are points  $s_1, s_2$  with

$$\frac{f(s_2) - f(s_1)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} + \frac{\tilde{f}(s_2) - \tilde{f}(s_1)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} > 2 - \varepsilon/2. \quad (2.3)$$

This implies that  $t_{n+1}$  cannot belong to any  $V_i$  since in  $V_i$  the second fraction of (2.3) is zero, but the first one is not greater than 1; hence  $t_{n+1}$  differs from all the other  $t_i$ . On the other hand, by our construction  $\|\tilde{f}\| \leq 1 + \varepsilon/2$ , so the second fraction of (2.3) is  $\leq 1 + \varepsilon/2$ . Hence there is an estimate for the first fraction, namely

$$\frac{f(s_2) - f(s_1)}{\rho(s_1, s_2)} > 1 - \varepsilon,$$

which means that  $t_{n+1}$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -point of  $f$ .  $\square$

Next we are going to characterise local metric spaces intrinsically, at least in the compact case, using the following geometric property that we have chosen to give an ad-hoc name.

**Definition 2.7.** A metric space  $K$  has *property (Z)* if the following condition is met: Given  $t, \tau \in K$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is some  $z \in K \setminus \{t, \tau\}$  satisfying

$$\rho(t, z) + \rho(z, \tau) \leq \rho(t, \tau) + \varepsilon \min\{\rho(z, t), \rho(z, \tau)\}. \quad (2.4)$$

A compact space satisfying (2.4) with  $\varepsilon = 0$  is easily seen to be metrically convex. Thus, property (Z) is “ $\varepsilon$ -close” to metric convexity, and there are instances when (Z) actually implies metric convexity; see Corollary 2.10 and Remark 2.11 below.

Here is the connection between locality and property (Z).

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $K$  be a metric space.*

- (a) *If  $K$  is local, then  $K$  has property (Z).*
- (b) *If  $K$  is compact and has property (Z), then  $K$  is local.*

*Proof.* (a) Assume that  $K$  fails property (Z), i.e., for some  $t_0, \tau_0 \in K$  and  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  there are no points  $z \in K \setminus \{t_0, \tau_0\}$  as in (2.4). For a point  $z \in K$  let  $r(z) = \rho(z, t_0)$ ,  $s(z) = \rho(z, \tau_0)$  and  $d = \rho(t_0, \tau_0)$ . Pick  $\varepsilon > 0$  with

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} < \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4}.$$

Now define  $f: K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} \max\{d/2 - (1 - \varepsilon)s(z), 0\} & \text{if } r(z) \geq s(z), \quad r(z) + (1 - 2\varepsilon)s(z) \geq d, \\ -\max\{d/2 - (1 - \varepsilon)r(z), 0\} & \text{if } r(z) \leq s(z), \quad (1 - 2\varepsilon)r(z) + s(z) \geq d. \end{cases}$$

This function is well defined, since for  $r(z) = s(z)$  both parts of the definition yield 0, and all points of  $K$  are covered in the two “if” cases by our assumption on  $K$ ; note that  $2\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ .

Let us show that  $f$  is a Lipschitz function with  $\|f\| = 1$ . Indeed, the only critical case is to estimate  $f(z_2) - f(z_1)$  when  $f(z_2) > 0$  and  $f(z_1) < 0$ ; in this case

$$\begin{aligned} f(z_2) - f(z_1) &= \left(\frac{d}{2} - (1 - \varepsilon)s(z_2)\right) + \left(\frac{d}{2} - (1 - \varepsilon)r(z_1)\right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{r(z_2) + (1 - 2\varepsilon)s(z_2)}{2} - (1 - \varepsilon)s(z_2)\right) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{(1 - 2\varepsilon)r(z_1) + s(z_1)}{2} - (1 - \varepsilon)r(z_1)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(r(z_2) - s(z_2)) + \frac{1}{2}(s(z_1) - r(z_1)) \\ &\leq \rho(z_1, z_2); \end{aligned}$$

also, the norm is attained at  $\tau_0, t_0$ , i.e.,  $f(\tau_0) - f(t_0) = \rho(\tau_0, t_0)$ .

Consider now points  $z_1, z_2 \in K$  where

$$\frac{f(z_2) - f(z_1)}{\rho(z_2, z_1)} > 1 - \varepsilon; \quad (2.5)$$

we shall show that then  $z_1$  is close to  $t_0$  and  $z_2$  is close to  $\tau_0$  so that their distance is necessarily big. Obviously, we must have  $f(z_2) > 0$  and  $f(z_1) < 0$  for (2.5) to subsist. In particular, we have

$$\rho(z_1, t_0) < \rho(z_1, \tau_0); \quad \rho(z_2, \tau_0) < \rho(z_2, t_0). \quad (2.6)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \varepsilon)\rho(z_1, z_2) &< f(z_2) - f(z_1) \\ &= \left(\frac{d}{2} - (1 - \varepsilon)\rho(z_2, \tau_0)\right) - \left(\frac{d}{2} - (1 - \varepsilon)\rho(z_1, t_0)\right) \\ &= d - (1 - \varepsilon)(\rho(z_2, \tau_0) + \rho(z_1, t_0)); \end{aligned}$$

in other words

$$(1 - \varepsilon)(\rho(z_1, z_2) + \rho(z_2, \tau_0) + \rho(z_1, t_0)) < d$$

so that

$$\rho(z_k, t_0) + \rho(z_k, \tau_0) < \frac{d}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad k = 1, 2. \quad (2.7)$$

By our choice of  $\varepsilon_0$ ,  $t_0$ ,  $\tau_0$  and (2.6)

$$\rho(z_1, t_0) + \rho(z_1, \tau_0) \geq d + \varepsilon_0 \rho(z_1, t_0)$$



so that by (2.7)

$$d + \varepsilon_0 \rho(z_1, t_0) < \frac{d}{1 - \varepsilon}$$

and hence  $\rho(z_1, t_0) < d/4$  by our choice of  $\varepsilon$ . Likewise  $\rho(z_2, \tau_0) < d/4$  and consequently  $\rho(z_1, z_2) > d/2$ . Therefore,  $K$  cannot be local.

(b) Assume that  $K$  is not local. Then there is a Lipschitz function  $f$  with  $\|f\| = 1$  for which (2.1) is impossible for  $\tau_1, \tau_2$  at small distance, viz. for  $\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2) < \varepsilon$ . By a compactness argument one hence deduces the existence of points  $t, \tau \in K$  such that

$$\frac{f(\tau) - f(t)}{\rho(\tau, t)} = 1 \quad (2.8)$$

and  $\rho(t, \tau)$  is minimal among all points as in (2.8). Now let  $\varepsilon_n \searrow 0$  and apply condition (Z) to  $t, \tau$  and  $\varepsilon_n$ . This yields a sequence of points  $z_n \in K \setminus \{t, \tau\}$  such that

$$\rho(t, z_n) + \rho(z_n, \tau) \leq \rho(t, \tau) + \varepsilon_n \min\{\rho(z_n, t), \rho(z_n, \tau)\}. \quad (2.9)$$

Passing to a subsequence we may assume that  $(z_n)$  converges, say  $z_n \rightarrow z_0$ , and that without loss of generality

$$\rho(t, z_n) \leq \rho(\tau, z_n) \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (2.10)$$

Note that

$$\rho(t, z_0) + \rho(z_0, \tau) = \rho(t, \tau). \quad (2.11)$$

If  $z_0 \neq t$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\geq \frac{f(z_0) - f(t)}{\rho(z_0, t)} = \frac{f(\tau) - f(t)}{\rho(\tau, t)} \frac{\rho(\tau, t)}{\rho(z_0, t)} - \frac{f(\tau) - f(z_0)}{\rho(\tau, z_0)} \frac{\rho(z_0, \tau)}{\rho(z_0, t)} \\ &\geq \frac{\rho(\tau, t)}{\rho(z_0, t)} - \frac{\rho(z_0, \tau)}{\rho(z_0, t)} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

by (2.11), and thus  $f$  attains its norm at the pair  $z_0, t$ . But by (2.10)

$$\rho(t, z_0) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\rho(t, z_0) + \rho(\tau, z_0)) = \frac{1}{2}\rho(t, \tau),$$

which contradicts the minimality condition imposed on the pair  $t, \tau$ .

Therefore,  $z_n \rightarrow t$ , and for sufficiently large  $n$  we have  $\rho(t, z_n) < \varepsilon$  along with (2.9). But then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(z_n) - f(t)}{\rho(z_n, t)} &= \frac{f(\tau) - f(t)}{\rho(\tau, t)} \frac{\rho(\tau, t)}{\rho(t, z_n)} - \frac{f(\tau) - f(z_n)}{\rho(\tau, z_n)} \frac{\rho(\tau, z_n)}{\rho(t, z_n)} \\ &\geq \frac{\rho(\tau, t) - \rho(\tau, z_n)}{\rho(t, z_n)} \geq 1 - \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

by (2.9), which contradicts our choice of  $f$ , since  $\rho(t, z_n) < \varepsilon$ .  $\square$

The definition of locality immediately implies that a compact local space is connected; one just has to apply the definition with the indicator function of a set that is both open and closed. We will now present a class of compact metric spaces for which property (Z) and hence locality implies (metric)

convexity. Recall that a Banach space  $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$  is called *locally uniformly rotund* if for each  $x \in S_E$  and  $\eta > 0$  there is some  $\delta = \delta_x(\eta) > 0$  such that  $\|x - y\|_E \leq \eta$  whenever  $y \in B_E$  and  $\|\frac{1}{2}(x + y)\|_E \geq 1 - \delta$ .

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$  be a smooth locally uniformly rotund Banach space and let  $K \subset E$  be a compact subset with property (Z). Then  $K$  is convex.*

*Proof.* By a result of Vlasov ([12], [11, Th. 2.2, p. 368]) a compact Chebyshev subset of a smooth Banach space is convex. If we assume that  $K$  is not convex, this means that there are two points  $P, Q \in K$  and a ball  $B$  whose interior does not intersect  $K$  with  $P, Q \in \partial B$ ; we may assume that  $B$  is centred at the origin,  $B = B_E(0, \alpha)$ , and by scaling that  $\|P - Q\|_E = 1$ . Applying condition (Z) to  $P, Q$  and an arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$  yields some  $z = z(\varepsilon) \in K \setminus \{P, Q\}$  as in (2.4). We may as well assume that  $z_0 = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} z(\varepsilon)$  exists;  $z_0$  lies on the line segment  $[P, Q]$  by strict convexity of  $E$ . Thus  $z_0 = P$  or  $z_0 = Q$ ; without loss of generality let us assume the latter. Fix, for the time being,  $\varepsilon$  and  $z = z(\varepsilon)$  and put  $r = \|z - Q\|_E (< 1/2)$ .

Now consider  $Q(\lambda) = \lambda P + (1 - \lambda)Q$ ,  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ . Let us estimate  $\|z - Q(\lambda)\|_E$  in order to derive a contradiction. On the one hand we have, since  $z \in K$  and thus  $\|z\|_E \geq \alpha$ ,

$$\|z - Q(\lambda)\|_E \geq \|z\|_E - \|Q(\lambda)\|_E \geq \alpha - \|Q(\lambda)\|_E =: \varphi(\lambda).$$

Now  $\varphi$  is a concave function of  $\lambda$  with  $\varphi(0) = 0$  and

$$\varphi(1/2) = \alpha - \left\| \frac{1}{2}(P + Q) \right\|_E > 0$$

by strict convexity. Hence with  $\sigma = 2\varphi(1/2)$

$$\|z - Q(r)\|_E \geq \varphi(r) \geq \sigma r. \quad (2.12)$$

On the other hand, (2.4) means that  $z \in B_E(P, 1 - r + \varepsilon r)$ ; therefore the point  $w = \frac{1}{2}(z + Q(r))$  also belongs to this ball, but  $w \notin \text{int } B_E(Q, r - \varepsilon r)$ . In other words,

$$\left\| \frac{(Q - z) + (Q - Q(r))}{2} \right\|_E = \left\| Q - \frac{z + Q(r)}{2} \right\|_E \geq r - \varepsilon r. \quad (2.13)$$

Specifically, let  $\eta = \sigma/2$  and  $0 < \varepsilon < \delta_{P-Q}(\eta)$ . Then (2.13) and local uniform rotundity (note that  $(Q - z)/r, (Q - Q(r))/r \in B_E$ ) imply that

$$\|z - Q(r)\|_E \leq r\eta < r\sigma$$

contradicting (2.12).  $\square$

Proposition 2.9 applies in particular to  $L_p$ -spaces for  $1 < p < \infty$  and most particularly to Hilbert spaces.

We can sum up the previous results as follows.

**Corollary 2.10.** *Let  $K$  be a compact metric space. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $K$  is local;

- (2)  $K$  is spreadingly local;
- (3)  $K$  has property  $(Z)$ .

If  $K$  is a subset of a smooth locally uniformly rotund Banach space, then a further equivalent condition is:

- (4)  $K$  is convex.

Another link between locality and metric convexity is provided by the following technical remark.

*Remark 2.11.* Let us say that  $K$  satisfies  $(Z')$  if in addition to (2.4) in Definition 2.7 we require that

$$\rho(z, \tau) \leq \rho(z, t).$$

Since one can exchange the roles of  $t$  and  $\tau$  here, this means that there is one point as in (2.4) that is closer to  $\tau$  than to  $t$  and another one that is closer to  $t$  than to  $\tau$ . It is then possible to show that  $(Z')$  implies metric convexity for compact spaces; see below. Hence locality implies metric convexity for those compact metric spaces that are symmetric in the sense that for any two points in  $K$  there is an isometry on  $K$  swapping these two points.

To prove this remark, we rephrase property  $(Z')$  by saying that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and every  $t, \tau \in K$  there exists some  $z \in K \setminus \{\tau\}$  such that

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\rho(\tau, z) + \rho(t, z) \leq \rho(t, \tau), \quad (2.14)$$

$$\rho(\tau, z) \leq \rho(t, z). \quad (2.15)$$

The strategy of the proof will be to infer from this in the compact case that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and every  $t, \tau \in K$  there exists some  $z \in K$  for which (2.14) holds and

$$\frac{1}{10}\rho(t, \tau) \leq \rho(\tau, z) \leq \frac{9}{10}\rho(t, \tau). \quad (2.16)$$

If we let  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  and consider a limit point  $z_0$  of the  $z = z(\varepsilon)$  satisfying (2.14) and (2.16), then we can be certain that  $z_0 \neq t$  and  $z_0 \neq \tau$ , but

$$\rho(t, z_0) + \rho(z_0, \tau) = \rho(t, \tau). \quad (2.17)$$

As remarked earlier this implies the metric convexity of the compact space  $K$ .

Let us now come to the details. Fix  $t, \tau$  and  $\varepsilon$ ; we may suppose that  $\rho(t, \tau) = 1$ . Assume for a contradiction that we cannot achieve (2.14) and (2.16) simultaneously. Let

$$K_0 = \{z \in K: (2.14) \text{ and } (2.15) \text{ hold}\}.$$

Since  $K_0 \neq \{\tau\}$  by property  $(Z')$ , there is some  $u \in K_0$  such that  $\rho(u, t) < 1$ , and therefore  $\alpha := \min\{\rho(z, t): z \in K_0\}$  is attained at some  $u_0 \in K_0 \setminus \{\tau\}$ . Then  $(1 - \varepsilon)\rho(\tau, u_0) + \rho(u_0, t) \leq 1$  by (2.14). Now define  $0 \leq \tilde{\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon$  by

$$(1 - \tilde{\varepsilon})\rho(\tau, u_0) + \rho(u_0, t) = 1. \quad (2.18)$$

If  $\tilde{\varepsilon} = 0$ , we have already found a point as in (2.17), and we are done. So we assume that  $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$  in the sequel. Then we can apply (2.14) and (2.15),

i.e., property (Z), with  $t$ ,  $u_0$  and  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$  in place of  $t$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\varepsilon$ . This yields some  $\tilde{z} \in K \setminus \{u_0\}$  with

$$(1 - \tilde{\varepsilon})\rho(u_0, \tilde{z}) + \rho(t, \tilde{z}) \leq \rho(t, u_0), \quad (2.19)$$

$$\rho(u_0, \tilde{z}) \leq \rho(t, \tilde{z}). \quad (2.20)$$

Next, add (2.18) and (2.19) to obtain

$$(1 - \tilde{\varepsilon})(\rho(\tau, u_0) + \rho(u_0, \tilde{z})) + \rho(t, \tilde{z}) \leq 1. \quad (2.21)$$

But  $\rho(t, \tilde{z}) < \rho(t, u_0) = \alpha$ , since  $\tilde{z} \neq u_0$  in (2.19); hence  $\tilde{z} \notin K_0$ . Now the previous inequality, (2.21) and  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon$  show that  $\tilde{z}$  satisfies (2.14); therefore it must fail (2.15), i.e.,

$$\rho(\tau, \tilde{z}) > \rho(t, \tilde{z}). \quad (2.22)$$

Also, recall that  $u_0$  satisfies (2.14) and that we have assumed that (2.14) and (2.16) do not hold simultaneously. This implies that

$$\rho(\tau, u_0) < 1/10 \quad \text{or} \quad \rho(\tau, u_0) > 9/10$$

and

$$\rho(\tau, \tilde{z}) < 1/10 \quad \text{or} \quad \rho(\tau, \tilde{z}) > 9/10.$$

If  $\rho(\tau, u_0) > 9/10$ , then  $\rho(t, u_0) > 9/10$  by (2.15); recall that  $u_0 \in K_0$ . Then (2.18) furnishes the contradiction

$$1 = (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon})\rho(\tau, u_0) + \rho(u_0, t) > (2 - \tilde{\varepsilon})\frac{9}{10} > 1$$

if, say,  $\varepsilon \leq 1/4$ . The conclusion at this point is

$$\rho(\tau, u_0) < 1/10. \quad (2.23)$$

On the other hand, if  $\rho(\tau, \tilde{z}) < 1/10$ , then  $\rho(t, \tilde{z}) > 9/10$  by the triangle inequality, which contradicts (2.22). Consequently

$$\rho(\tau, \tilde{z}) > 9/10. \quad (2.24)$$

If we now use that  $\tilde{z}$  satisfies (2.19) and (2.20), we derive, for  $\varepsilon \leq 1/4$ , that

$$\rho(u_0, \tilde{z}) \leq \rho(t, \tilde{z}) \leq 1 - (1 - \varepsilon)\rho(\tau, \tilde{z}) \leq \frac{13}{40}$$

and hence the contradiction

$$\rho(\tau, t) \leq \rho(\tau, u_0) + \rho(u_0, \tilde{z}) + \rho(\tilde{z}, t) < 1.$$

This completes the proof of the remark.

We do not know any example of a compact space with (Z) that is not metrically convex.

## 3. LOCALITY AND THE DAUGAVET PROPERTY

We can now prove a sufficient criterion for  $\text{Lip}(K)$  to have the Daugavet property. In particular it turns out that for closed convex subsets of Banach spaces  $\text{Lip}(K)$  has the Daugavet property.

**Theorem 3.1.** *If  $K$  is a spreadingly local metric space (in particular if  $K$  is a metrically convex or a compact local metric space), then  $\text{Lip}(K)$  has the Daugavet property.*

*Proof.* For short write  $X = \text{Lip}(K)$ . Due to Lemma 1.1 it is sufficient to prove that for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4]$ , and for every  $f, g \in S_X$  the closed convex hull of the set  $W = \{u \in (1 + \varepsilon)B_X : \|f + u\| \geq 2 - \varepsilon\}$  contains  $g$ .

In order to do this fix an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and select  $\varepsilon/2$ -points  $s_1, \dots, s_n$  of  $f$ . Let  $r \in (0, \varepsilon/4]$  be a number so small that the balls  $U_i = B_K(s_i, r)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , are disjoint. Fix a  $\delta < r^2/16$ , and select  $t_i, \tau_i \in B_K(s_i, \delta)$  such that

$$f(\tau_i) - f(t_i) > (1 - \varepsilon/2)\rho(t_i, \tau_i). \quad (3.1)$$

Consider  $K_i = (K \setminus U_i) \sqcup \{t_i, \tau_i\}$  as a subspace of the metric space  $K$ . Define  $u_i: K_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:  $u_i(t_i) = g(t_i)$ ,  $u_i(\tau_i) = g(t_i) + f(\tau_i) - f(t_i)$  and  $u_i(s) = g(s)$  on the rest of  $K_i$ . It follows from Lemma 2.5 that  $u_i$  satisfies a Lipschitz condition on  $K_i$  with the constant  $1 + r/2 < 1 + \varepsilon/2$ . Extend  $u_i$  to a function on  $K$  preserving the Lipschitz constant, still denoted by  $u_i$ .

Note that each  $u_i$  belongs to  $W$ . In fact  $\|u_i\| \leq 1 + \varepsilon$  by construction and

$$\|f + u_i\| \geq \frac{(f + u_i)(\tau_i) - (f + u_i)(t_i)}{\rho(\tau_i, t_i)} = 2 \frac{f(\tau_i) - f(t_i)}{\rho(\tau_i, t_i)} > 2 - \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand the arithmetic mean of the  $u_i$  (the simplest convex combination) approximates  $g$ , for

$$\left\| g - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \right\| = \frac{1}{n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (u_i - g) \right\| \leq \frac{4 + 2\varepsilon}{n}.$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that each  $u_i - g$  has norm  $\leq \|u_i\| + \|g\| \leq 2 + \varepsilon$  and their supports  $U_i$  are disjoint.  $\square$

Finally we address the question in how far our locality conditions are necessary for the Daugavet property; for compact spaces, this will turn out to be the case (Theorem 3.3 below). The bulk of the technical work will be done in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose  $\text{Lip}(K)$  has the Daugavet property. Then for every  $t_1, t_2 \in K$  with  $\rho(t_1, t_2) = a > 0$ , for every  $f \in S_{\text{Lip}(K)}$  with  $f(t_2) - f(t_1) = a$  (i.e.,  $f$  attains its norm at the pair  $t_1, t_2$ ) and for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there are  $\tau_1 = \tau_1(\varepsilon), \tau_2 = \tau_2(\varepsilon) \in K$  with the following properties:*

- (1)  $f(\tau_2) - f(\tau_1) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ ;
- (2)  $\rho(t_1, \tau_2) - \rho(t_1, \tau_1) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ ,  
 $\rho(t_2, \tau_1) - \rho(t_2, \tau_2) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ ;

(3)  $\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

*Proof.* We shall abbreviate  $\text{Lip}(K)$  by  $X$ . Consider the following functions  $y_i \in X$ :

$$y_1 = f, \quad y_2(t) = \rho(t_1, t), \quad y_3(t) = -\rho(t_2, t).$$

For all these functions we have

$$y_i(t_2) - y_i(t_1) = a, \quad \|y_i\| = 1. \quad (3.2)$$

Then the arithmetic mean  $y = (y_1 + y_2 + y_3)/3$  is of norm 1 as well. Consider  $x^* \in X^*$ , with the action

$$x^*(x) = \frac{1}{a}(x(t_2) - x(t_1)). \quad (3.3)$$

Clearly  $\|x^*\| = 1$ . Due to the Daugavet property of  $X$  there is, by Lemma 1.1, an  $x \in S_X$  such that  $x^*(x) > 1 - \varepsilon$ , i.e.,

$$x(t_2) - x(t_1) > (1 - \varepsilon)a, \quad (3.4)$$

and at the same time  $\|x - y\| > 2 - \varepsilon/3$ . The last condition means that there are two distinct points  $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in K$  for which

$$(x - y)(\tau_1) - (x - y)(\tau_2) > (2 - \varepsilon/3)\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2),$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^3 ((x - y_i)(\tau_1) - (x - y_i)(\tau_2)) > (2 - \varepsilon/3)\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2).$$

Since neither of these three summands exceeds  $2\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ , we get the following three inequalities:

$$(x - y_i)(\tau_1) - (x - y_i)(\tau_2) > (2 - \varepsilon)\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2), \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (3.5)$$

Taking into account  $x(\tau_1) - x(\tau_2) \leq \rho(\tau_1, \tau_2)$  we deduce that

$$y_i(\tau_2) - y_i(\tau_1) > (1 - \varepsilon)\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2), \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (3.6)$$

The case  $i = 1$  gives us the requested property (1), and the cases  $i = 2, 3$  of (3.6) immediately provide property (2). Finally, substituting the Lipschitz conditions  $x(\tau_1) \leq x(t_1) + \rho(t_1, \tau_1)$  and  $x(\tau_2) \geq x(t_2) - \rho(t_2, \tau_2)$  into (3.5) and applying (3.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (2 - \varepsilon)\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2) &< x(t_1) - x(t_2) + \rho(t_1, \tau_1) + \rho(t_2, \tau_2) + y_i(\tau_2) - y_i(\tau_1) \\ &\leq -(1 - \varepsilon)\rho(t_1, t_2) + \rho(t_1, \tau_1) + \rho(t_2, \tau_2) + \rho(\tau_1, \tau_2), \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \varepsilon)\rho(t_1, t_2) &< \rho(t_1, \tau_1) + \rho(t_2, \tau_2) - (1 - \varepsilon)\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2) \\ &\leq (2 - \varepsilon)(\rho(t_1, \tau_1) + \rho(t_2, \tau_2)) - (1 - \varepsilon)\rho(t_1, t_2) \end{aligned}$$

by the triangle inequality; hence

$$2\rho(t_1, \tau_1) + 2\rho(t_2, \tau_2) > 4(1 - \varepsilon)/(2 - \varepsilon)\rho(t_1, t_2).$$

Adding to this inequality both inequalities from property (2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho(t_1, \tau_1) + \rho(t_2, \tau_2) + \rho(t_1, \tau_2) + \rho(t_2, \tau_1) \\ & \geq 4(1 - \varepsilon)/(2 - \varepsilon)\rho(t_1, t_2) + 2(1 - \varepsilon)\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2). \end{aligned}$$

Since the left hand side is not greater than  $2\rho(t_1, t_2)$  we deduce

$$2(1 - \varepsilon)\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2) \leq \left(2 - 4\frac{1 - \varepsilon}{2 - \varepsilon}\right)\rho(t_1, t_2)$$

which gives property (3).  $\square$

We can now deduce the main theorem of this paper.

**Theorem 3.3.** *If  $K$  is a compact metric space, then  $\text{Lip}(K)$  has the Daugavet property if and only if  $K$  is local.*

*Proof.* The “if” part has already been proved in Theorem 3.1. Let us prove the “only if” part. Assume  $K$  is not local. Then there is a function  $f \in \text{Lip}(K)$ ,  $\|f\| = 1$ , and there is an  $r > 0$  such that

$$f(\tau_2) - f(\tau_1) < (1 - r)\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2) \quad (3.7)$$

for every  $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in K$  with  $\rho(\tau_1, \tau_2) < r$ . Hence by a compactness argument there is a pair of points  $t_1, t_2 \in K$  with  $\rho(t_1, t_2) > 0$  on which  $f$  attains its norm, i.e., with  $f(t_2) - f(t_1) = \rho(t_1, t_2)$ . If nevertheless  $\text{Lip}(K)$  has the Daugavet property, then applying Lemma 3.2 to  $f$  and these  $t_1, t_2$  with  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  entails a contradiction between (3.7) and properties (1) and (3) from the lemma.  $\square$

The space  $\text{Lip}(K)$  has a canonical predual, called the Arens-Eells space in [13] and the Lipschitz free space in [4] and [7]. Since we have used in (3.3), in the proof of Lemma 3.2, a functional from that predual, i.e., a weak\* open slice, the lemma works under the assumption that the Lipschitz free space on  $K$  has the Daugavet property. Consequently, for a compact metric space  $\text{Lip}(K)$  has the Daugavet property if and only if its Lipschitz free space has.

In the setting of subsets of certain Banach spaces like  $L_p$ ,  $1 < p < \infty$ , we can rephrase Theorem 3.3 as follows, using Corollary 2.10.

**Corollary 3.4.** *If  $K$  is a compact subset of a smooth locally uniformly rotund Banach space, then  $\text{Lip}(K)$  has the Daugavet property if and only if  $K$  is convex.*

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. BENYAMINI AND J. LINDENSTRAUSS. *Geometric Nonlinear Functional Analysis, Vol. 1*. Colloquium Publications no. 48. Amer. Math. Soc., 2000.
- [2] D. BILIK, V. KADETS, R. SHVIDKOY AND D. WERNER. *Narrow operators and the Daugavet property for ultraproducts*. Positivity **9** (2005), 46–62.
- [3] C. FOIAŞ AND I. SINGER. *Points of diffusion of linear operators and almost diffuse operators in spaces of continuous functions*. Math. Z. **87** (1965), 434–450.
- [4] G. GODEFROY AND N. KALTON. *Lipschitz-free Banach spaces*. Studia Math. **159** (2003), 121–141.

- [5] V. M. KADETS, R. V. SHVIDKOY, G. G. SIROTKIN, AND D. WERNER. *Banach spaces with the Daugavet property*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **352** (2000), 855–873.
- [6] V. M. KADETS, R. V. SHVIDKOY, AND D. WERNER. *Narrow operators and rich subspaces of Banach spaces with the Daugavet property*. Studia Math. **147** (2001), 269–298.
- [7] N. KALTON. *Spaces of Lipschitz and Hölder functions and their applications*. Collect. Math. **55** (2004), 171–217.
- [8] T. OIKHBERG. *The Daugavet property of  $C^*$ -algebras and non-commutative  $L_p$ -spaces*. Positivity **6** (2002), 59–73.
- [9] W. RUDIN. *Functional Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- [10] R. V. SHVIDKOY. *Geometric aspects of the Daugavet property*. J. Funct. Anal. **176** (2000), 198–212.
- [11] I. SINGER. *Best Approximation in Normed Linear Spaces by Elements of Linear Subspaces*. Springer, 1970.
- [12] L. P. VLASOV. *Chebyshev sets in Banach spaces*. Soviet Math., Doklady **2** (1962), 1373–1374.
- [13] N. WEAVER. *Lipschitz algebras*. World Scientific, 1999.
- [14] D. WERNER. *The Daugavet equation for operators on function spaces*. J. Funct. Anal. **143** (1997), 117–128.
- [15] D. WERNER. *Recent progress on the Daugavet property*. Irish Math. Soc. Bull. **46** (2001), 77–97.
- [16] P. WOJTASZCZYK. *Some remarks on the Daugavet equation*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **115** (1992), 1047–1052.

FACULTY OF MECHANICS AND MATHEMATICS, KHARKOV NATIONAL UNIVERSITY,  
 PL. SVOBODY 4, 61077 KHARKOV, UKRAINE  
*E-mail address:* `ivakhnoj@yandex.ru`

FACULTY OF MECHANICS AND MATHEMATICS, KHARKOV NATIONAL UNIVERSITY,  
 PL. SVOBODY 4, 61077 KHARKOV, UKRAINE  
*E-mail address:* `vova1kadets@yahoo.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FREIE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN, ARNIMALLEE 2–6,  
 D-14 195 BERLIN, GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* `werner@math.fu-berlin.de`